



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

opened door. Few are the visitors to a museum who are incapable of being moved by beauty. Though they may come in and look blankly at the early Italian Madonnas at first, yet when their eyes are opened they see. The sense of beauty is in themselves, and the pictures are sometimes the media through which they realize what are their own possibilities. In this connection I sometimes think of those who enter a Shinto Temple in Japan. There is an empty room with a mirror at one end. He who approaches and looks may see what he has made of himself.

So most of us bring great potential powers of enjoyment into a museum. How much we find depends largely on what we have developed within ourselves.

Many who give one superior glance at primitive art, and scornfully walk away, might well read Wordsworth's lines.

Stranger! henceforth be warned; and know that pride,
Howe'er disguised in its own majesty,
Is littleness; that he who feels contempt
For any living thing hath faculties
Which he has never used; that thought with him
Is in its infancy.

The Place of the Fine Arts in Higher Education: RALPH ADAMS CRAM,
Boston.

Note: Mr. Cram spoke extemporaneously, and the following epitomizes what he said.

It may seem to some of you that this is an inopportune moment for the consideration of art of any kind. Today, and indeed for nearly four years, we have been called upon, on the one hand to witness the progressive destruction of the great art work of the past, and on the other to bend all our energies (at least those of the civilized portions of the globe) to the defeat of the Huns of modernism, in order that this process of destruction may be brought to an end and made impossible for the future. There is little opportunity for us to produce art of any kind or even to think about it. Art does not synchronize with war, though it undoubtedly follows the conclusion of a righteous war. While, therefore, the question of art is for the moment in abeyance, we look to the future when the great threat to civilization being terminated, society

may go ahead on new and better lines, expressing its new and better civilization in the form of art.

The old doctrine of "art for art's sake" is dead. This is one of the merciful results already achieved through the war. We know now, or at all events suspicion is dawning in our minds, that art is after all the best and most reliable teacher of real history. One of its functions (by no means the only one) is to reveal the best in any time or amongst any people. This it always has done in the past, and the art, of whatever sort, that the world has revered, is the expression not of the average, and by no means of the worst, but on the contrary of the very best that is achieved by any civilization at any time.

If this is true, and the records prove its verity, it is also true, and natural, that art lingers on for a space after the cultural force is spent. Art is a result, not a product. It follows from certain sane and wholesome conditions of life. Therefore, it follows on in a sense even after the dynamic influence has ceased to operate. This explains how it is that frequently the highest achievements of art show themselves at the very moment that civilization has begun to break down through process of degeneration.

Art has a real value, however, apart from historic elucidation. It is not an amenity of life, but a heritage, an attribute of wholesome living. It is perhaps in its highest sense a symbolical expression of the otherwise inexpressible, so it links up with sacramentalism, the great philosophical system developed by Christianity and the only system that is consonant therewith. Art is a necessary gloss on all things. Through it we perceive and interpret as is possible after no other fashion. Art is also a factor in the solution of world-problems. Perhaps one of the greatest weaknesses in contemporary civilization is specialization and the isolation of all things one from another. We have imprisoned each consideration of life in its own box stall. We have followed the system of the pigeon hole and the card catalogue. Out of the war must come, amongst other things, recognition of the fact that all our problems are linked together. Not one can be solved without reference to

others. Hitherto the method of the specialist has intruded into all studies as well as into life itself; the result is the "expert," the specialist, the man who is trained to see, and only sees, those things that lie within the narrow limits of some special category to which he has devoted himself. Apart from war, surgery and civil government, the specialist is only too frequently "a blind leader of the blind."

Now in art for instance, we usually find this "subject" taught in all our schools, academies and universities either as archaeology or as aesthetics. Both I conceive to be wrong. There is, I think, no less valuable field of investigation than that of philosophical aesthetics, for it leads nowhere. It cannot work toward the production of art, nor toward an appreciation thereof. As for art-archaeology, it is equally useless except for a few of the curious who are by nature delvers in the unrevealed. Art is a force and a living force. Aesthetics and archaeology void it of its vitality, and they appear only in that fast darkening period when the vital spark is fading, and the conditions of life make the instinctive production of art no longer inevitable.

It is after the same fashion that we teach Latin, philosophy and literature. Those who assail the "cultural studies" have a certain justification behind them in the manifold defects of the contemporary system. If these, and all other branches of liberal education, could be taught once more as living things, the contentions of Mr. Flexner and others of his ilk, would lose their last semblance of justification. We must admit, I think, that our educational system has gone wrong. Sense of the true object of education has been lost. This object is not revenue. It is not even mental training. *It is character.* Until education is conceived in these terms and as a means of developing character, it will fail of its essential object.

Now as I have said, in the current teaching of art, the archaeological or historical method, and that also of philosophical aesthetics, wholly fail of their object. Art has little or nothing to do with dates, schools, methods, my very good friend Berenson to the contrary, notwithstanding. It has even less to do with aesthetic

theory. From Plato and Aristotle onward, the development of a philosophy of aesthetics has been a matter singularly interesting to the philosopher, and there is perhaps a place for this, however narrow may be its limitations. So far as the general public is concerned, however, that is to say, those who find their education in our schools and universities and who are not looking forward to the practice of any one of the arts, it is, I conceive, practically meaningless. What we want is an appreciation of the function and power of art and the development of a real liking for good art as opposed to the bad.

What then can be said in the line of developing a constructive system of art-education in schools and colleges? First, I should say would come the necessity of broadening the scope of this word "art" until it includes not only painting, architecture and sculpture, but also the equally great arts of music, poetry and the drama, and as well the so-called "minor arts" of carving in wood and stone, metal work of all kinds, stained glass, and indeed all the crafts that at present are superciliously ignored by the devotees of the so-called "fine arts." The art impulse is one but with many manifestations. There is really no difference in kind between the impulse that produces the Van Eyck triptych, the Venus of Milo, or Reims Cathedral, and that which shows itself in the stained glass of Chartres, the metal work of Hildesheim and Nuremberg, or the tapestries of Flanders. All grow from the same dynamic force and toward the same end.

Again, art cannot be taught alone. It must join with history, literature and philosophy. In teaching something of the art of Greece, the intellectual and spiritual history of the Hellenic race must be absolutely assimilated therewith. In themselves they were not separated, and we ourselves may see through this intimate union, what the life was, and through that life what drove the art and what this art strove to express. In the same way Roman civilization explains its art, and the art explains its civilization. So also of Byzantine work; we have acquired an entirely false idea of the culture of the people and the time through disregarding the

art of its expression. As for Mediaevalism, the life and the art are inexplicable if they are considered apart. Through Reims and Westminster and Siena and Venice we gain a new vision of the great reality that lay behind this marvelous flowering of all the arts, and once we achieve this, then we appreciate better than we can after any other fashion the altogether supreme qualities of the art of this triumphant epoch of Christian civilization. We have misunderstood the Renaissance as we have misunderstood Mediaevalism, and partly because we have ignored the art-expression of the time. We have lumped it all together as "Renaissance art," quite disregarding the fact that all that art of the early Renaissance was the actual product of the antecedent force of Mediaevalism, and we have failed to find in the grossness and the vulgarity of the art of the later Renaissance that revelation it so clearly makes of the similar qualities in the life itself. Of course the same thing is true of modernism, of our own period, during which the revolution effected by the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Revolution has come to its full fruition and expressed itself in the terms of industrial civilization. Test this civilization by the art of the last 100 years, and we see at once how thin and poor it was, and how eminently deserving of that destruction now in process.

I do not mean to say that none has understood this. I am thinking particularly of four men who have seen it clearly, John Ruskin, Ch. Diehl, Henry Adams and Kingsley Porter. Read your Ruskin again and see how, in spite of the harsh blight of an inherited Protestantism he still understood the intimate association between art and life. Read Diehl if you would know something of Byzantine civilization, read Henry Adams and Porter and find therein revelation of what Mediaevalism was, beyond what it is stated to have been by the purblind commentators of modernism.

For a third suggestion I should urge a concentration on great epochs and on the reconstruction of the line of succession between them. The whole thing is a wonderful and varied progress through sequent centuries and changing races. Forget the archaeology of

Babylonia, Crete, Egypt. Realize that the great sequence is from Greece to Rome, to Byzantium, Gothic, Early Renaissance and the Pagan Renaissance. There is enough here "to hold us for a while," and we can well ignore the preliminary stages, and the alien developments in Asia which are wholly outside our own line of racial and cultural development.

We cannot disguise the fact that under modernism art had become an alien thing and artificial, and this is true for the first time in history. Let us try to build up, above all things, appreciation of good art and an understanding of its function as an expression of the best in all times and all people. Perhaps more than anything else, it is necessary for us to avoid the error that there is no such thing as absolute beauty. There is, as you know, a class of people who would make of beauty merely a personal reaction, without definiteness or certainty. This is folly. Beauty is as absolute a thing as truth, right and justice, and we are bound to find out what this absolute is and proclaim it from the housetops. So taught, art should be compulsory in every school or college, even if by making it compulsory we have to oust algebra, physics, psychology and "business science." After reading, writing and simple ciphering, the essentials in education are history, literature, logic, Latin, philosophy, and art, all voided of archaeological elements and taught as living things.

In the next room I have seen today, and you can see, a demonstration of the elementary results that are possible when beauty is recognized as absolute and art is taught as a living thing. What Miss Kallen has been able to achieve through her work with little children in elementary schools contains within itself more promise for the future than all the so-called art-education in our institutions of higher learning. This is ideal art and practical art, and if I could, I would see this sort of thing extended through all our elaborate scheme of education. You cannot make artists by any intensive process of education, but you can instill into children sense of beauty and sense of craftsmanship. With this as a foundation, it should be possible in the higher grades of education to reveal the splendour and

the nobility and the significance of the great art which is the perfect showing forth of the greatness of past civilizations.

For all art is taught better by example than by precept. If our cities are ugly, our life uglier and our schools and colleges barren and mechanistic not only in their visible expression but in their educational system, then the teaching of art is pretty nearly useless. It is the form of life and not the method of instruction that brings art into being. The life of modernism has destroyed art because it has reversed all our standards of comparative value, laying stress on the insignificant and the unimportant, ignoring the things which are eternally valuable. Out of the war must come the reversal of these standards of comparative value. We must substitute the qualitative standard for the quantitative standard. We must concentrate on the real things of life. True democracy is incompatible with "big business" and "high finance." Both must be scrapped. True democracy cannot exist under an imperialistic regime, and imperialism is, and has been, the law of life of modernism. All these things must go onto the pyre of great burning, for today we are called upon as never before to reject the bad and reclaim the good. To us, as to King Clovis standing before the baptismal font of the Cathedral of Reims, the words are said, "Bow thy proud head, Sicambrian; destroy what thou worshipped, worship what thou destroyed."

Design, Craftsmanship and the Imitation of Nature in Ancient Art:
CLEMENT HEATON, *New York*.

A long acquaintance with ancient art from the time of the Greeks and Assyrians to the end of the Mediaeval epoch, has made its general character so familiar to the writer, that modern art appears as a whole, sharply in contrast with what for so long had been done by all nations. This generalization arose by an unconscious and intuitive perception, but it was later analysed critically. I say this to explain how the point of view grew up that I here seek to communicate.

In Mediaeval and other ancient art as a whole, there seems to have been no desire for a purely realistic